

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,142	05/14/2001	Adrian David Lincoln	211202	1124
23460 7590 10/03/2007 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900			EXAMINER	
			CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
emendo, in	00001 0731		2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

8

Application No. Applicant(s) 09/855,142 LINCOLN ET AL. Notice of Abandonment Art Unit Examiner Azizul Choudhury 2145 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address-This application is abandoned in view of: 1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 02 May 2006. (a) A reply was received on 02 August 2007 (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated 24 July 2007), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of 6 month(s)) which expired on 24 July 2007. (b) A proposed reply was received on , but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114). (c) A reply was received on 8/2/07 but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the nonfinal rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below). (d) No reply has been received. 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due. The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$ (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received. 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply. (b) No corrected drawings have been received. 4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants. 5. 🗌 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on ____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims. 7. The reason(s) below: See Continuation Sheet JASON CARDONE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER AC Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to

minimize any negative effects on patent term.



Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: On 11/7/06, the applicant filed an amendment without arguing any of the actual rejections issued in the non-final. The principle argument provided within that amendment stated that the interview requested with the RCE was not provided and hence the non-final issued was improper and should be withdrawn. The examiner called the applicant on 11/7/06 notifying them that a non-responsive was being sent (which was mailed 1/24/07) and that the examiner still failed to receive an agenda for the interview. On 8/2/07 the office received an interview agenda but still no arguments to the non-final. In addition, the date on the agenda filed is stamped as being received on 8/2/07 which, is past the 6 month due date.